

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY REVIEW BOARD
General Administration Building
210 11th Street SE, Conference Room 332
Olympia, Washington
January 12, 2006
9:00 AM

Final Minutes

| <u>MEMBERS PRESENT</u> | <u>REPRESENTING</u> | <u>MEMBERS ABSENT</u> | <u>REPRESENTING</u> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| David D. Johnson | Construction Trades Labor | Appointment Pending | House of Representatives (R) |
| Rocky Sharp | Specialty Contractor | Sen. Dave Schimdt | Senate (R) |
| Ed Kommers | Specialty Contractor | Gerald "Butch" Reifert | Design Industry |
| Carolyn Crowson | OMWBE | | |
| Olivia Yang | Higher Education | | |
| John Lynch (Chair) | General Administration | | |
| Rodney Eng | Cities/Counties/Ports | | |
| Michael Mequet | Cities/Counties/Ports | | |
| Wendy Keller | Public Hospital Project Rvw Bd | | |
| Dan Vaught | School District Project Rvw Bd | | |
| Rep. Kathy Haigh (Vice Chair) | House of Representatives (D) | | |
| Gary Ballew | Cities/Counties/Ports | | |
| Larry Byers | Insurance/Surety Industry | | |
| Daniel Absher | General Contractor | | |
| Sen. Phil Rockefeller | Senate (D) | | |

STAFF & GUESTS

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Nancy Deakins, GA | Larry Stevens, MCA, NECA |
| Searetha Kelly, GA | |
| Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services | Stan Bowman, AIA WA Council |
| Nora Huey, King County | Duke Schaub, AGC |
| Dick Goldsmith, AWPFD | Tom Peterson, Hoffman Construction |
| Ashley Probart, AWC | Darlene Septelka, King County |

Welcome & Introductions – Chair's Comments

Chair John Lynch called the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board (CPARB) meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

A meeting quorum was attained. Chair Lynch reviewed the meeting agenda.

Chair Lynch thanked members for attending the Governor's Boards and Commission Conference on December 15, 2005.

Chair Lynch referred to the topic of e-mails and whether e-mailing constitutes a meeting of a board or commission. The training reflected that if e-mails are used for transmitting information, it does not constitute a meeting but when e-mails began to be a forum for sharing ideas and opinions, then e-mailing can become a meeting.

One issue to be considered is how the CPARB will be funded in the second year of the biennium. Currently, second year funding for the Board is not included in the Governor's budget. The funding level for the first year is \$75,000.

Members were referred to an account summary of the Board dated January 12, 2006. Chair Lynch noted the CPARB will continue to meet beyond July 2007.

Daniel Absher arrived at the meeting at 9:12 a.m.

Nancy Deakins reviewed the projected budget for fiscal year 2006. Included in the 2007 budget projection is \$10,000 for a data system. Some funding is anticipated for data collection. Several members pointed out the budget amount of \$10,000 appears to be too low. Ms. Deakins requested Representative Haigh and Senator Rockefeller considering taking the 2007 budget request to the Legislature.

Representative Haigh arrived at the meeting at 9:15 a.m.

Chair Lynch said approximately \$75,000 is the basic funding required for operating the CPARB. He suggested adding a more appropriate amount for data collection, such as \$75,000, as a separate decision package for data collection. Darlene Septelka reported the Office of Financial Management (OFM) has submitted a budget request for \$500,000 for its data collection update. OFM representatives have conveyed they are willing to add additional elements the CPARB believes should be collected. However, OFM is only willing to add the elements for state projects only.

Wendy Keller suggested including data collection and include a more descriptive detail, such as initial examination of data system alternatives with a realistic budget of approximately \$25,000 to \$50,000. The initial amount should clearly address that the funding is for the study, evaluation, and seed money for a data system.

Rep. Vice CHaigh asked whether the exclusion of funding from the Governor's budget was intentional or an oversight. Chair Lynch said it was more than an oversight as the Department of General Administration requested the funding through the Governor's Office. Representative Haigh affirmed she and Senator Rockefeller will pursue discussions. Senator Rockefeller concurred that a budget request of \$78,000 is not sufficient to include a data element. He asked about a more realistic amount that would cover the data collection element. Chair Lynch suggested discussing the budget need with Ms. Deakins and Ms. Septelka and providing the information to Representative Haigh and Senator Rockefeller.

Approve Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

Approval of December 8, 2005 Minutes

Olivia Yang and Rodney Eng arrived at the meeting at 9:23 a.m.

Gary Ballew moved, seconded by Rocky Sharp, to approve the minutes of December 8, 2005 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Reports from Subcommittees

Data Collection Subcommittee – Darlene Septelka

Ms. Septelka reported the subcommittee met on January 6, 2006. Members discussed OFM and what the agency reports on and its process. OFM is revising its data collection system and is willing to work with the subcommittee to incorporate any items that the subcommittee needs into OFM's new system but only for state projects. This could result in two systems – one to collect data for state projects and another for other public entities. Ms. Septelka said data from two different systems needs to be studied and considered. She pointed out it is easier to have one system rather than two different systems. OFM reviewed its system based on the JLARC report and has submitted a \$500,000 budget request to begin the process. Ms. Deakins said the effort initially will correct some elements within the system that are not working and that the budget request is an initial amount.

Ms. Septelka said there was interest by the subcommittees for a combined system for all public projects. The subcommittee needs to step back and ascertain whether two systems will be needed. At the last meeting, there was little representation from private owners due to the holidays. The goal is to consider how private owners benchmark their respective projects. Ms. Crowson has discussed the issue with other private owners. The goal is to consider what is currently collected by private owners to avoid requesting information that private owners are not currently providing for private projects.

Subcommittee members also discussed data collection and the process. There was some confusion within the subcommittee about the expectations of the CPARB. The confusion appears to be a belief that the CPARB is expecting collections to occur in 2006 along with issuance of a report. Some subcommittee members believe this year's effort is to define the data that is required and that no report will be developed. While others believe a report will be issued before the end of the year to support the sunset. She asked the CPARB about the direction the subcommittee should be pursuing.

Representative Haigh said it's the subcommittee's job to define reporting requirements and perhaps make a recommendation about the documents. It appears that the subcommittee will need to work closely with OFM. GC/CM project proponents will need to have information on what data they will be collecting and reporting. In terms of timeliness, the subcommittee should have reporting requirements established. Ms. Septelka confirmed the subcommittee is comfortable providing information to the CPARB by May 2006 on the data elements that should be collected. Chair Lynch pointed out that prior to the 2007 session more information will be needed about how successful GC/CM projects have been. If the information is not available, it could hurt potential reauthorization of GC/CM and other alternative public works processes.

Ms. Septelka asked whether the data collected for the 107 projects reviewed in the previous year will be utilized. She asked whether the report she and her colleague completed needs to be updated. Chair Lynch said the report is good information and perhaps it will only involve a matter of refreshing and updating the report as well as including some projects that have been completed since the report was completed. Ms. Septelka suggested that a totally new report with all the data elements the subcommittee determines are necessary will not likely be completed by the end of the year.

Dan Vaught said the school districts are committed to collecting and organizing data but want to know what the template will be. The more information available, the more the school districts can begin organizing projects currently underway as well as for projects that have been completed. It is timely for there to be some benchmarking. He commented on the possibility of project sponsors to take the initiative and complete analysis and include the perspective of the architect and the contractor.

Representative Haigh commented that during the subcommittee's first few meetings, members agreed that the focus should be from the present day forward rather than looking at how information could be obtained from previous projects. The subcommittee's focus was what will be needed in the future as much of the information is not available on projects previously completed.

Ms. Septelka said it's possible to have what needs to be benchmarked defined by the May timeline. She cautioned the CPARB about the work involved in analyzing the data and preparing a report and suggested recruiting another academic volunteer who may be interested in providing the support or perhaps contracting with a consultant.

Ms. Keller said she believed the main mission is to establish a set of parameters. Ms. Septelka replied that is what the subcommittee is looking at. The subcommittee wants to ascertain what was missed and what other people are collecting and present what the subcommittee believes is a good system to the CPARB that will provide good benchmarking.

Chair Lynch suggested preparing some information of the 18 authorized school projects on how well the projects were completed. Mr. Vaught said he's learned much about the projects within the last several weeks as he was asked to collect additional information for the CPARB meeting. In general, everyone who has participated in the process from the school district's perspective wants to benchmark their efforts against districts and similar projects to measure their own success. There are several more completed projects that speak to some success and there is also consternation about the major escalation that has occurred over the last several years. People want ways to network and compare apples to apples relative to solving some of the problems they have been experiencing with ways to establish the MACC, for example. School districts are prepared to participate in collecting data and potentially in pooling resources to help analyze the data.

Ms. Septelka said during the subcommittee meeting discussion about interest in measuring GC/CM or Design Build (DB) against the traditional Design-Bid-Build (DBB) it was noted that because some projects and agencies are so varied, the only place that benchmarking across delivery methods will be with the schools because they do have a number of schools that are still being built through DB. This would be area where some benchmarking and delivery comparison data could be captured. If projects are \$10 million or above, most agencies that can use GC/CM or DB. When projects are above \$10 million most are using alternatives and less DBB. School projects are the only ones where the subcommittee believes they can capture delivery comparison information.

Senator Rockefeller cited information in the December 5 minutes indicating the Data Collection Subcommittee will develop a list of project performance measures and complete a matrix by November 11. The matrix will be in the areas of schedule performance, cost performance, contract changes, contract selection process, subcontractor selection, third-party consultants, protests and claims, and quality performance. However, the current discussion is focusing on the distinction between school projects. The data elements appear to be generic. Even though the architecture and specifications for a project may differ the goal is to look at cross-cutting measures so that the CPARB has some basis for considering the relative importance of each of the methods. It's an important issue the CPARB must be clear about because if a matrix or structure is to be constructed for the collection of data, the Legislature will want it to be across all sectors.

Representative Haigh said it will be the same data that is collected through a common matrix. However, it is when the data is collected that the differences will begin to be discovered. Senator Rockefeller recommended creating a common framework to apply the data. Ms. Septelka said the subcommittee is currently considering what needs to be collected within the major areas and what measures are appropriate within the different areas. The subcommittee needs between and May to develop the areas and provide a recommendation to the CPARB that it believes are the areas that will provide the most useful information.

Representative Haigh asked whether there is an entity that examines basic construction costs associated with construction materials such as steel, wood, etc. that provides cost forecasts. Chair Lynch replied that *Engineering News Record* is one source. GA provides information from *Engineering News Record* to OFM, which is used in the agency's standard capital budgeting process. Representative Haigh inquired whether the data information should include what the costs were estimated using the various source guides versus the actual costs. Ms. Septelka confirmed cost projections versus actual costs are a big issue and that there have been some huge jumps that were not estimated. It is difficult to estimate the inflation factor in some commodities when negotiating a MACC for a three or four-year project. Ms. Keller said some of the criteria for evaluating the projects consider what economic factors beyond the sponsor's control impacted the project. She shared other sources of potential economic information at the national level, such as the Bureau of Prisons and Department of Justice.

Mr. Absher said the industry uses the *Engineering News Record* as well but that it only provides information about commodities escalation and not market conditions. The Puget Sound area in the last several years has been saturated and consequently prices have increased higher than the rate of inflation. He cited a school project and costs associated with mechanical pricing. Market fluctuations are difficult to predict. He inquired about the reason for capturing data associated with inflation. Representative Haigh said in the long-term, the CPARB will be ascertaining whether GC/CM is good process to some extent by whether there was more "bang for the buck."

Chair Lynch noted that many things happen that are not the fault of the process. Mr. Absher added it will be difficult to objectively provide the information because each project is different and encounters different situations. Ms. Septelka said data pertaining to economic factors will also provide some answers such as whether there were extreme economic factors that impacted the project and what they were.

Reauthorization Subcommittee – Rodney Eng

Mr. Eng reviewed the purpose of the Reauthorization Subcommittee. Subcommittee members are undertaking many discussions and trying to achieve a consensus as it moves toward drafting specific legislative language for changes to existing legislation for alternative public works. Currently, four task forces have been established. Due to the holidays, two task forces did not meet.

Mr. Eng reviewed the results of the two task forces that did meet. There appears to be a limited number of contractors awarded GC/CM contracts. The question is what is in the statute that is limiting the number of other contractors engaged in the GC/CM process. The specific task the task force considered is whether there are additional criteria that should be included in the statute to address the issue. Task force members concluded there should be no additional information and, if anything, the addition of more criteria pertaining to who is a qualified for GC/CM would likely have the opposite effect and would limit competition more. Consensus was generally attained about not including more criteria. There was however, additional discussion about whether some criteria should be eliminated or revised. There was also discussion about whether there are other factors, other than the qualifications of a contractor that are causing an apparent limited market.

Mr. Eng said the second task force meeting discussion pertained to owner and project eligibility, which included a lively discussion on a number of issues but no general consensus. There were three issues:

- Adding an architect to the selection committee for the GC/CM – *potential consensus*
- Owner & project eligibility – *proposal by task force includes a review board similar to school project and hospital project review boards to review both the project and the owner eligibility. There was not full consensus on the issue. There were concerns raised by existing jurisdictions that have authority who believe it might not be necessary for them since they are already qualified and know how to select projects. There were many owners who presently*

have the authority that were not opposed to the concept. Several points raised included some owners who have some autonomy from state overview that could be subject to a state board approval for projects as well as whether a review board is necessary and will it create an additional administrative burden on an already expensive and burdensome public works contracting process. There were a majority of the task force members who believe a review board might be appropriate but no consensus was attained. Some guidance or suggestions to help attain consensus included having a two-tier system review board or substitute the review board for the public process, which doesn't appear to provide any particular benefit to anyone.

Ms. Keller added a representative from the Data Collection Subcommittee attended and said a review board would be the ideal place to start collecting data, even with a tiered-board process.

Chair Lynch pointed out that a review board option would eliminate many processes that currently exist, such as the school district and hospital processes. There are varying ways in the statute of defining authorized users that do not make much sense in the big picture. It begs the question of why there are so many different measures for who is qualified. A review board would consolidate the process and provide one tool and lessen the conflicts associated with the statute.

Mike Mequet expressed support for the proposal but cautioned that the primary concern is the schedule and if a review board extends the process it will become a concern. Mr. Eng said the logistics of a review board was briefly discussed ranging from how to create and fund a review board to how often the review board would meet. A member noted that there are only approximately 12 GC/CM projects that are initiated each year and that the review board option should not be a burden by having the board consider all projects.

Mr. Johnson noted that if a review board were established, it could also become a central clearinghouse on an ongoing basis for projects under construction that could provide information on what data is needed when a project is completed. The effort would essentially be a real-time database that could be adjusted or tweaked as needed when projects are reviewed.

Ms. Septelka commented about the difficulty of ascertaining which alternative public works projects began construction in 2005. There is no single entity that can supply the information. There is no central collection, which was an issue addressed in the JLARC report.

Olivia Yang suggested the concept of a central review board is a good idea if it is a way of streamlining and standardizing criteria. However, such review board approval should not be in addition to current requirements. Many owners are facing pressures associated with responsiveness of delivery times. She asked how a state board would be centralized as her employer (University of Washington) would have concerns if the board is located in eastern Washington. The review board must streamline the process and be responsive. Quite frequently, it is in the administration of contracts where issues arise. The University of Washington utilizes a pool of individuals for dispute resolution, which provides some continuity and precedence. Perhaps the CPARB could become a resource in the building of precedence in the administration and interpretation of contracts.

Expansion Subcommittee – Olivia Yang

The subcommittee met on January 6 and discussed three areas.

A request was received for membership on the subcommittee from Roger Benson from Mortensen and Dick Goldsmith, representing public hospitals. The subcommittee has attained the membership limit of 15 people.

The subcommittee recommends that in the interest in increasing diversity of opinions and volunteers, the CPARB approve two additional members.

The School District provided a presentation in support of pursuing interim authorization for 10 school projects during 2006 because the School District's limit has been attained. The subcommittee reviewed the request and discussed the number of projects, data collection and incorporating the data matrix within the project, and the review process and offered suggestions.

The subcommittee's third discussion involved organizing the subcommittee towards what it wants to accomplish in 2006. In previous meetings, the subcommittee discussed two goals – addressing School District needs and preparing for the sunset of current law.

The subcommittee developed a work plan from February through July focusing on GC/CM, project criteria, and owner criteria. The subcommittee will spend June on DB and July on JOC. A question was asked whether to consider new alternatives. However, there were strong feelings that the proposed work plan is more than adequate and that new methods could be discussed in 2009.

Rodney Eng moved, seconded by Dave Johnson, to authorize 17 members on the Expansion Subcommittee. Motion carried.

Chair Lynch conveyed his appreciation to subcommittee members for their work to date. Chair Lynch said for his own purpose he may develop a spreadsheet of all issues of the subcommittees to track the status, completion of actions, and next steps for the CPARB.

The meeting was recessed for a break from 10:29 a.m. to 10:47 a.m.

School District and Hospital Review Boards, Screening and Results

Ms. Keller reviewed additional information included in each member's agenda packet.

Ms. Keller reviewed the Public Hospital District Review Board (PHDRB) process. The membership of the PHDRB is broad-based and balanced between public and private representation.

In the Board's application process, the Board elected to utilize a standardized application packet as well as standardized instructions. Application packages are limited to 20 pages. Board members are provided with the packets in advance of the meeting. Board members contact staff for any questions the applicant needs to address. Each applicant is allocated 30 minutes to present the project to the Board. Boardmembers can ask direct questions and each member retains their own notes. The Board deliberates on each of the elements within the packet. Applicants may stay during the deliberation.

Types of evaluation items requested from applicants include:

- Sufficient drawings to depict extent of project
- Schedule depicting key dates
- Project organizational chart
- Budgets identifying entire project, status of funding, and portion assigned to design, internal management, equipment, and construction.

Projects not approved are disapproved for a multitude of reasons.

The Board reviewed five projects and approved three. Another applicant attending the meeting opted not to submit an application.

Mr. Vaught referred members to materials previously requested by the CPARB including membership of the School District Review Board, criteria used to review projects, summary of applications, examples of project applications. Additionally, meeting minutes have been included as well as the draft legislation School Districts are requesting. February school bond measure information was also provided.

Mr. Vaught said he has followed up with various schools slated for projects and asked schools with bond measures to provide additional information about the types of projects included in the bond measures.

Mr. Vaught reviewed the authorizing legislation for the School District Project Review Board, membership, and a sample of the project application.

Mr. Vaught reviewed a summary of the applications for School District Demonstration Projects for GC/CM from 2000 to 2005. In the last week, several school districts have been contacted to provide a status on their respective projects.

Mr. Vaught reviewed several project applications, board meeting minutes, selected bond measures for February 7, 2006, and draft proposed legislation for the 2006 session. The bond measures will fund four new high schools, 14 renovations of existing high schools, six new middle or junior high schools, 15 renovations of middle or junior high schools, 13 new elementary schools, and 31 renovations of elementary schools. The secondary schools are the projects that typically qualify for GC/CM. New schools have typically been rejected for GC/CM. Essentially, the bond measures call for 29 renovations that could potentially qualify for GC/CM.

Mr. Vaught described why the recommendation for 10 school projects has been requested. He explained some of the problems encountered by some schools but that overall the comments from the school districts have been positive. In general GC/CM has been very successful for school districts.

Mr. Sharp commented that he can understand GC/CM for remodels but not for new schools. He asked about the criteria for selecting a project for a new school versus a bidding process. Mr. Vaught referred to a small, isolated school district in eastern Washington. The situation involved the school superintendent also acting as the capital projects director and construction manager. GC/CM appealed to the school district because of the expertise of both the contractor and architect to the school district and assisting the district through the planning process involving a restricted budget that would benefit the school district. A majority of the boardmembers believed that level of collaboration could benefit the school district.

Mr. Sharp inquired about the justification for the Aberdeen School District receiving approval for GC/CM. Mr. Absher provided information about the justification. The Aberdeen project was one of the community's largest projects and was highly visible. The site was difficult and it involved elements of remodeling and demolition of existing buildings. It was not a straight new school construction project.

Mr. Vaught noted two projects not listed that were declined. They included projects at the Edmonds School District and the Steilacoom School District.

Discussion ensued about the reasons for GC/CM for new schools and that there are other reasons, such as site conditions that justify the GC/CM process.

Mr. Eng asked whether the review board is adequately reviewing the projects to ascertain if they qualify as GC/CM projects. Mr. Vaught said the board is transitioning from pilot projects for authorization to continuing projects and that the review criteria will likely be strengthened.

Chair Lynch noted the School District Review Board has been in existence for approximately five years and on average there have been 4 projects selected annually. He asked about changes in the market or school funding that requires 10 projects within the next year. Mr. Vaught replied the board considered the volume of bond issues and as some school districts complete successful projects there is recognition of the clear benefits for the GC/CM process. More school districts are interested in using the process to complete some of the more complex school projects. Having skilled contractors involved in the design early on in the process is a huge benefit for school districts. A more accurate characteristic of the request is “up to 10 projects” rather than “10 projects.” The goal has been to find a middle ground based on the information, past practice, as well as looking at the GC/CM as an opportunity that appears to have merit. Representative Haigh added that if the legislation is too limited on the number of school projects, it will limit the data collection effort. She said she supports a recommendation of up to 10 school projects.

Ms. Crowson asked whether the legislation will include collection of data. Mr. Vaught said the legislation does not speak to data collection. Mr. Vaught suggested that if the criteria are delineated in a way that the school districts can respond to what data collection means, the school districts will embrace and support hiring an expert to complete the data collection, primarily because from district to district, the level of qualifications may be different. Perhaps by standardizing the expectation and by requesting the data, more collaboration will likely occur from the school districts. Most school districts hire professional consultants to represent them.

Mr. Stan Bowman, AIA, said he has spoken with Charlie Brown, who represents a number of schools. The discussion referred to seven projects over the next 18 months as an appropriate number of projects to reauthorize. It would provide sufficient projects for data collection as well.

Mr. Eng said his concern is with a qualified project that could not use GC/CM because there was insufficient authorization. Another element to consider is if there is a board that qualifies and selects the projects, why is there legislation limiting the number of projects?

Ms. Deakins asked if the authorization has been an issue for some projects not utilizing the GC/CM process. Mr. Vaught said it was but that as additional authorizations became available the school districts resubmitted the projects. Mr. Eng asked whether that caused a delay in the projects. Mr. Vaught responded that it did likely result in some delays.

Mr. Bowman offered additional information about why some are arguing for a limit in the number of school projects. The reason is because the industry is looking for a short term extension for schools until the reauthorization occurs. Those that have concerns about GC/CM are willing to hold their concerns back for a limited period of time knowing that the CPARB is working through the difficulties and possible changes. Opening the process to a high number of projects did not appear to be appropriate in the environment.

Ed Kommers moved, seconded by Rocky Sharp, to recommend the draft legislation to the legislature offered by the School District Project Review Board to include authorization for 23 school projects (changing the statute from 16 to 23 to allow the School District Project Review Board the opportunity to approve seven additional projects).

Mr. Kommers said the reason for seven projects is that the construction community’s platform has been not to support anymore expansion until the issues have been resolved. A number of construction groups have supported no expansion until the issues are resolved. However, the industry also recognizes the reality of the school districts to complete school projects. Adding 10 was too many for many in the construction industry but authorizing seven is more agreeable and the board has indicated it can work with seven.

Ms. Crowson suggested including language about data collection requirements. Representative Haigh offered that legislative staff can revise the language to include a data collection element.

Mr. Eng reiterated that 10 projects make just as much sense especially if the process relies on a board review.

Rocky Sharp moved, seconded by Michael Mequet, to amend the motion to include language within the draft legislation requiring data collection with the details to be defined later. Motion carried.

Rodney Eng moved, seconded by Gary Ballew, to amend the motion to authorize 10 additional projects rather than seven projects.

Mr. Sharp reported he recently attended a meeting in Seattle of specialty contractors (electrical) and that none of the contractors will support 10 school district projects for GC/CM. As a whole they do not support it. It will be a major hurdle to overcome just for the legislation to be renewed. If the authorization is for 10 school projects, there will be some arguments within the electrical industry.

Chair Lynch said he expressed an opinion at the subcommittee meeting that strategically, the lower number might be better to recommend from the CPARB as it represents more caution and is closer to being consistent with the number of projects previously completed.

Mr. Absher said there will not be any project from the seven projects that will provide sufficient data for the next legislative session. Whether the authority is seven or ten, the project will not be far enough long to provide meaningful information. On behalf of the construction industry, the desire is to restrain and act slowly.

Mr. Ballew supported Mr. Eng's standpoint that a board reviews the projects and he supports expansion to 10 projects.

Mr. Byers said the Hospital Districts actually compare GC/CM to DBB and consider the added benefits for GC/CM versus DBB. It appears that in the information from the School District that the process is not similar to the Hospital Districts review. He asked whether the School District Project Review Board evaluate the projects in terms of whether it meets the criteria for GC/CM or whether the Board considers why it is better than DBB. Mr. Vaught confirmed the Board does review the benefits and that its part of the oral presentation and subsequent board review process.

The motion failed. Gary Ballew and Rodney Eng voted for.

Mr. Vaught shared comments about the proposal between seven and 10 projects. The idea of agitating the contracting community by selecting a number between seven and ten is not rational. It is important to the school districts that the CPARB is considering a recommendation and in the spirit of building consensus and sustaining the momentum he said he is comfortable with the recommendation.

Mr. Sharp added that within the electrical contracting community, the desire is for zero. Both he and Mr. Kommers are willing to consider how to support the school districts. A fewer number is more acceptable to the industry. He stressed the importance of working together to resolve the issue.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Absher thanked Ms. Keller and Mr. Vaught for the presentation and materials.

Ms. Keller asked whether the school district board meetings are recorded. Mr. Vaught noted the board is considering improvements in the preparation of minutes. Ms. Keller suggested CPARB members could listen to the meeting tapes to gain a better understanding of the review process.

CPARB Progress Report to the Legislature

Chair Lynch asked members to review draft information about CPARB's Strategic Plan and Report to the Legislature and asked members to e-mail specific comments and changes to him or staff. The draft will be reviewed through GA's legislative process and a final version should be completed before the end of January. He asked for members to submit any changes or comments by January 20.

Mr. Eng asked if the information will be sent prior to the next meeting in February. Chair Lynch replied the information will be forwarded prior to CPARB's next meeting. Representative Haigh offered that legislative staff will work with the School District on the proposed language and that the CPARB's recommendation should be conveyed to the Legislature by a letter from the CPARB Chair.

Rodney Eng moved, seconded by Gary Ballew, to authorize the Chair to forward the Strategic Plan and Report to the Legislature and to make any minor changes as recommended by members. Motion carried.

Next Meeting Agenda

The next meeting is Thursday, February 9, 2006 at the GA Building, Room 332.

Adjournment

Chair Lynch adjourned the meeting at 11:52 a.m.

John Lynch, Chair, CPARB

Prepared by: Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services